

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

Letters Patent Appeal No.1236 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of Decision: October 26, 2016

Jasvinder Singh

.....Appellant

versus

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT.

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUDIP AHLUWALIA.

Present: Mr.Rajbir Sehrawat, Advocate, for the appellant.

-. -

1. Whether Reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Surya Kant, J. (Oral)

This letters patent appeal challenges the order dated 28.04.2016 whereby claim of the appellant for appointment as a Constable in Haryana Police has been rejected by learned Single Judge on two counts. Firstly, on the ground of concealment of material information in the form filled up for character verification and secondly, on the ground of delay. The information which the appellant is said to have failed to disclose pertains to registration of two criminal cases against him, the details of which find mention in the order under appeal.

Somewhat similar issue arose for consideration before a Division Bench to which one of us (Surya Kant, J.) was a member, in LPA No.406 of 2013 (Devender Kumar versus State of Haryana and others and connected cases, decided on 16.09.2016. This Court held as follows:-

“...[19] It may thus be seen that the appellant is guilty of concealing a vital information regarding his involvement in the criminal case, hence we are of the considered view that the distinction drawn by the Supreme Court in para

No.18 of its decision in Joginder Singh’s case (supra), applies in full force and the principle culled out in para No.17 cannot come to his rescue. Since the appellant can draw no advantage out of the decision in Joginder Singh’s case (supra), it is not necessary to elaborate the other binding decisions, some of which are relied upon by the learned Single Judge or those rendered subsequently, including in (i) Deputy Commissioner General of Police and another versus S.Samuthiram (2013) 1 SCC 598; (ii) Commissioner of Police, New Delhi and another versus Mehar Singh (2013) 7 SCC 685, and (iii) State of Madhya Pradesh and others versus Parvez Khan (2015) 2 SCC 591.

For the reasons assigned in the cited-decision, we are of the considered view that even if the ground of delay taken against the appellant is over-looked, yet his claim for appointment is liable to be rejected on the very first ground, namely, concealment of material information.

We thus do not find any ground to interfere with the order under appeal.

Dismissed.

[SURYA KANT]
JUDGE

October 26, 2016
mohinder

[SUDIP AHLUWALIA]
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No